

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 29, 2008. Claims 1-66 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66. The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 33, and 50, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-16, 18-31, 33-48, and 50-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. in view of Alcorn et al.

Claims 17, 32, 49, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. in view of Alcorn et al further in view of Flesner et al.

Here, independent claim 1 is further amended to state “*wherein the second user interface is associated with one or more content selectors that can cause different content to be displayed based on dynamic evaluation of personalization rules.*”

Chowdhry discloses associating each user group with default pages (Paragraph [0260]). Alcorn teaches personalized web page of student-centric information accessed by a student and the administrator's environment used for maintenance of the system (Column 9, Lines 13-16). Flesner discloses a portal server that includes an administrator interface that enables an administrator to select from various layout styles.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Chowdhry nor Alcorn, nor flesner teaches or indicates the dynamic evaluation of personalization rules using one or more content selectors.

Thus, claim 1 should be in allowable condition as previously presented. Consequently, dependent claims 2-17 which are all based on independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Similarly, independent claims 18, 33 and 50 are all similarly amended as claim 1. Therefore, at least for the same reason, claims 18, 33 and 50 as currently amended should be in allowable condition as previously presented. Consequently, claims 19-32 which are all based on independent claim 18; dependent claims 34-49 which are based on independent claim 33; and dependent claims 51-66 which are all based on independent claim 50 should all be in allowable condition.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 27, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800